Ben Gurion For Peace Not Real Estate, P. 2

That Silent Majority Seems to Be Growing Bored

According to the Associated Press, 17,000,000 homes watched a movie on NBC the night Howard K. Smith interviewed Nixon and 14,000,000 others watched the Doris Day and Carol Burnett shows on CBS. Nixon ran third with 5,000,000 homes. The Nielsen ratings were not yet available on a national basis when we went to press but the New York area Nielsens were. These showed that ABC would have done better with its usual Monday night movie in that time slot. The average rating in January for the Monday night movie was 19%. Smith's interview with Nixon drew 7%.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

VOL. XIX, No. 7 April 5, 1971 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

Humphrey's Leadership Is Not Good Enough

A basic problem of mankind is to free itself from the tyranny of technology. That is why the defeat of the SST was of historic importance, and should encourage a fresh attempt to stop the ABM and the MIRV. The SST in the civilian, like ABM and MIRV in the military, field are examples of the inertial power of technological discovery. To have blocked the one shows it is possible to stop the other. The defeat of the SST was a defeat for that usually insuperable alliance of the military, its industrial suppliers and the organized labor movement also behind the continued arms race which ABM and MIRV entail. Indeed Stennis sought to rally support in the Senate for the SST by linking it with defense. The SST, he pleaded before the vote was taken, "is now the only connecting link, in the research, development, evaluation, testing and engineering . . . with the long-range bomber we have decided now we do need, the B-1." The old clincher didn't work. Proxmire of Wisconsin, who led the fight against the SST, has also been questioning the utility of a new bomber in the missile age, and may rally the Senate against the $370 million Nixon and Laird are asking for the B-1 in fiscal '72. This military SST will cost between $15 and $20 billion.

It Would Have Been Political Suicide

The defeat of the SST reflects an awakening in every section of this country to environmental dangers, to military waste and folly, and to the urgency of new priorities if our country's future is to be safeguarded. A new America, freed from the grip of militarism and imperialism, would be able at last to turn its giant energies to reconstruction and racial reconciliation. But such leadership cannot come from those who are wedded to the cold war and Pax Americana past, and willing to do little more than beat a minor tactical retreat—just like Nixon is doing—before the tidal wave of discontent and distrust. The country is fed up with the idea that the only way to combat unemployment is through highly lucrative contracts to socially wasteful aerospace and armament industries. An index of that revulsion was the failure of the AFL-CIO lobby to rally its liberal Democratic friends for the SST. Except for Jackson, not a single liberal Democratic presidential hopeful voted for the SST, Humphrey included. In the present temper of the country and especially its youth, it would have been political suicide for Humphrey to have done otherwise.

The day after the vote on SST, Humphrey delivered his first major address since reentering the Senate, on his old subject, the arms race. That speech, and his Moskowitz lecture at New York University last January 25 which foreshadowed it, shows the limitations of Humphrey's leadership. The speech called for a freeze on ABM and MIRV, and it came just in time. For three days later, on ABC TV's *Issues and Answers* even Jackson put forward a proposal of his own for a MIRV freeze. The old champion of disarmament could hardly afford to lag behind the Senator from Boeing. And the tide of animosity to the arms race must be high if even Jackson—Nixon's first choice for Secretary of Defense—feels impelled to offer a freeze proposal.

That Same Old Tunnel, 18 Years Later

Let me say I know when we are getting out. We have a plan, it is being implemented . . . But as far as a deadline is concerned, while the next announcement, I am sure, will give some indication as to the end of the tunnel, we are not going to tell them now . . .

—Nixon to Howard K. Smith, ABC-TV, March 27.

Henri Navarre himself is confident of ultimate victory, and he has communicated this to many of those [including Nixon at the time—IFS] who are counting on him. Said one of them last week: "A year ago, none of us could see victory. There wasn't a prayer. Now we can see it clearly—the light at the end of a tunnel."

—Time *Magazine cover story, "Navarre of Indo-China", September 28, 1953.* Barely six weeks later Nixon, then Vice President, turned up in Hanoi—yes, Hanoi, which then seemed to be firmly in French hands—to oppose a negotiated peace in Indochina.

The three points that Jackson put forward on TV seemed to presage the kind of phony formula to be expected of the Senate's foremost advocate of the arms race. It called for a one-year freeze on MIRV, combined with a freeze on more Soviet land-based missiles and a go-ahead for just the kind of ABM we are building. This would freeze U.S. superiority and keep alive Soviet fear that our ABM might develop into an area ABM and thus part of a first strike threat. It fails to meet the issue which seems to worry the other side most— our unwillingness to include 7,200 forward based U.S. nuclear weapons in any agreement freezing the number of strategic launchers. The Jackson proposal must be read against the realization that part of what is going on at SALT is maneuvering to blame any breakdown in the talks on the other side, so the Pentagon can then piously claim that we have no alternative but the arms race. Jackson's proposal fits that strategy.

Humphrey's speech is on a much higher level. Indeed it would have been a great speech two years ago. It has one novel idea, which we think other Senators and the peace movement might take up—the idea of putting MIRV funds in escrow while the negotiations are in progress, though a simpler and better way would be to vote down funds for ABM and MIRV

(Continued on Page Four)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EPITAPH (IN PLAIN AMERICANESE) ON THE INGLORIOUS END OF THE LAOTIAN INVASION: Was there ever a bigger bunch of blowhards, windbags and alibi artists than our Generals and their civilian chiefs?

Ben Gurion Speaks Up

ISRAEL'S ELDER STATESMAN, David Ben Gurion, himself a a hard liner in his time, says in the *Saturday Review* (April 3), "Peace Is More Important Than Real Estate". If he were still Prime Minister he would give back all the occupied territories and return to the 1967 borders except for East Jerusalem and the Golan Heights. "*Real* peace with our Arab neighbors—mutual trust and friendship," he said, "that is the only true security." The international conjuncture of events offers a rare opportunity for a settlement which can lay the foundations for such a peace. Rebuilt lives for Arab refugees in a Palestinian state of their own, not Sharm El Sheikh or some other Lilliputian border adjustment, is the key to a stable future.

A BIGOTED ATTORNEY GENERAL was reproved and the First Amendment widened when a three judge statutory court in New York ruled 2-to-1 that the government was wrong in denying a visa to the independent Belgian Marxist, Ernest Mandel, editor of *La Gauche,* to debate John Kenneth Galbraith at Stanford two years ago. The decision by Judge Dooling, with Judge Feinberg concurring, voids that section of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act of 1952 which bars "subversive" visitors unless specially exempted by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General. Rogers recommended but Mitchell denied the visa application. A group of scholars including Noam Chomsky and Robert Heilbronner thereupon retained the noted civil liberties lawyer Leonard Boudin as counsel and sued. The Court ruled that though Mandel, as an alien, had no constitutional right to enter, the scholars as American citizens had a right to free exchange of ideas under the First Amendment and that this and academic freedom were violated when the visa was denied. It would be ironic and shameful if on appeal the Supreme Court, as remolded by Nixon and Mitchell, at a time when the Soviet Union is turning back to neo-Stalinism, should also revert to closed society doctrine and reinstate this little Iron Curtain of our own.

"NIXON ON MARKET IS PROVING CORRECT AFTER 11 MONTHS," said a *New York Times* financial page headline March 28. The Dow-Jones index has indeed risen more than 40 percent since Nixon met privately with Wall Streeters at the White House last May and set the stage for the rise. But it went up because he told insiders he was going to pump fresh funds into the money market again. But the only rational basis for the rise is an unhealthy kind of confidence—confidence that we are facing another prolonged period of inflation because Nixon is determined to have a stock market boom for the election. Pumping in more credit (and further weakening the dollar) will not solve the long range problems of American business. The market rise is rouge on the pale cheeks of a sick economy.

The Buddy System on Capitol Hill

The leadership had the freshman Democrats down to a session the other day. All of them (House Speaker Albert, Majority Leader Boggs, Majority Whip O'Neil) were giving it to us: "Don't be afraid to speak out . . . we need you to prod us . . ." That sort of thing. Right then I thought about asking them about the Vietnam war resolution that's coming up at our next caucus. I started to say "what about helping us on this one?" But I didn't and it was all sort of buddy-buddy . . . I kicked myself later on for not doing it.

—Rep. Drinan (D.-Mass.) *Wash. Daily News Mar. 20.*

RAIL-PAX IS A NEW NAME for an old tactic that has been ruining U.S. railroads for a generation. The bright idea ever since bankers took control has been to meet changing conditions by giving less service for more money. The new national Railroad Passenger Corporation is a device to get around the ICC and cut passenger service more sharply than ever, this time to about half the existing lines. The result, predictably, will be fewer riders, lower revenues and a bigger bankruptcy.

"IT DOES APPEAR INCONSISTENT," Rep. Mikva (*D. Ill.*) told the House March 25 in a speech marking the 150th anniversary of Greek independence, "for a nation which has dedicated itself to liberating South Vietnam at virtually any price not even to be willing to speak out against the lack of basic freedoms in Greece." We applaud the irony but deny the inconsistency. The U.S. has spent $4 billion on Greece since 1946, and gave $45 million in arms last year to the Greek dictatorship, for the same reason we fight in Vietnam—to maintain strategic bases irrespective of popular wishes.

ADVERTISING AGE, "THE NATIONAL NEWSPAPER OF MARKETING", has jumped into the controversy over the CBS, "Selling of the Pentagon", with an editorial March 15 opposing government advertising on the ground that it could be used to punish dissent. It cited the threat to cut off CBS from the Army's new $10,600,000 radio-TV campaign. As our own

An Investors Magazine Skeptical About The Political Entanglement in Vietnam Oil

Clues are beginning to pile up that there may be huge quantities of crude oil in the waters of the Far East and Southeast Asia. Discoveries by Natomas, Atlantic Richfield, and Union Oil have triggered a frantic exploration race off Indonesia. An optimistic report by a United Nations team about possible oil deposits between Japan and Taiwan is fueling speculation that the entire Far East could contain oil deposits rivaling those of the Middle East. Some of these deposits would almost certainly lie off Vietnam. No drilling has taken place. But preliminary United Nations surveys have given the area good marks. There are plenty of rumors. One is that a British company has found signs of oil on the prison island of Con Son.

If the oil is there, or even probably there, the question of who rules in Saigon takes on a more than political significance. Already, U.S. antiwar groups are beginning to suggest that a desire to insure friendly governments in the Indochinese area could slow down President Nixon's withdrawal from the war. An organization called "Another Mother for Peace" has flooded the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with over 10,000 letters calling for hearings. Not surprisingly, the oil companies are less than anxious to discuss the topic.

In any case, mounting U.S. activity in the area raises huge political questions that must be balanced against the economic benefits for Southeast Asia and the U.S.: 1) Might a discovery lead to pressure for slowing down the pace of U.S. troop withdrawals? 2)Might oil industry agreements with the present Thieu-Ky regime commit the U.S. even closer to this controversial government? 3)If the war in Indochina bogs down permanently, won't the oil industry run the risk of being made the scapegoat for whatever goes wrong? 4)Is a "friendly" regime in Saigon really vital to U.S. access to such oil? After all, many Arab countries are rabidly unfriendly to the West but sell their oil there. 5) What will the effect be on the political and military policies of Japan and China?

—Forbes Magazine March 15 reprinted in the Congressional Record March 15, p.E1890 by Rep. Ryan (D NY) *with a plea for investigation by Senate Foreign Relations.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

contribution to the fracas we suggest that newspaper editors ask why the Pentagon, amid a flood of useless releases, withholds the texts of the speeches our Generals, from Westmoreland down, are constantly making in private VIP briefings around the country.

The GAO and The Arms Lobby

A TIP OF THE HAT to Bernard Nossiter for exposing (*Wash. Post* March 16, 18, 19 and 27) how the General Accounting Office allowed the big lobby trade associations of the military-industrial complex to soften its study of defense profits—a sample of 146 contracts showed a 56.1 percent return on equity capital, yet Deputy Defense Secretary Packard (*Wash. Post* financial page March 17 by Nossiter) thinks "we have to do something to get profits up a little bit"! And a bravo to Rep. Bob Eckhardt (*D. Tex*) and 12 other House Government Operations Committee members for forcing a public hearing on these curious revisions.

"THE NAVY," said the Business Week Letter March 1, "in arguing the need for a bigger U.S. fleet, postulates the Indian Ocean as the next major area of political competition between America and the Soviet Union. Some Navy geopoliticians even look sourly on any Middle East settlement that might reopen the Suez canal, thereby giving the Soviet fleet, including commercial vessels, easy access to the Indian Ocean." Prof. Howard Wriggins of Columbia, a member of the National Security Council staff 1967-8, told an Indian Ocean conference at Georgetown's hard-line Center for Strategic Studies March 27 that U.S. interests would best be served by announcing our desire for a nuclear-free Indian Ocean and a U.S.-Soviet agreement to limit deployment in this sea.

TOO LATE FOR THIS ISSUE we have just received from that "Citizens' Commission to Investigate the FBI" a selection of documents taken from FBI offices with a manifesto which says in part, "we believe that democracy can survive only in an order of justice, of an open society and public trust . . . we believe that the FBI has betrayed its democratic trust and we wish to present evidence for this claim to the open and public judgment of our fellow citizens." This is really in the Boston Tea Party tradition.

ALSOPOMANIA: "Yet optimism is in order," Joseph Alsop wrote March 24 about the end of the Laos invasion. "Suppose a man tries to cut his bitter enemy's throat, and instead only manages to break both his enemy's legs." What if he tries to cut an enemy's throat and only gets his own legs broken?

PERSONAL NOTE: On March 24 we were given a Special George Polk Memorial Award from Long Island University with this (somewhat overstated, we fear) citation:

I. F. Stone is most certainly a direct descendant of America's earliest editors and its personal journalists of the 19th and early 20th centuries. The man, the medium, the organization, and the drive were all one: at the very least, singular and unique; at most, courageous, exciting, a maker of events, and, perhaps, a phenomenon. We may appreciatively recall Franklin, Adams, Greeley, and, in our own century, McClure and Mencken. We do have I. F. Stone, and we must prize him, for his type is now scarce, indeed. As publisher/editor of I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly *(and, it should be noted, too, as a frequent contributor to* The New York Review of Books*), he has assaulted the military establishment, questioned the means and intent of civilian authority, dismayed and frightened men of power everywhere, and put obscure political complexities into brilliant focus for untrained mind and intellectual alike. His has been great political reporting that reaches readers not alone through its logic, but also through the profound sincerity that is its source.*

Helping Profits Instead of Consumer Demand

On January 11, President Nixon announced new depreciation rules allowing businesses a faster writeoff of expenditures for new equipment. The change will result in a reduction of Federal revenues of $2.7 billion in FY 1972, rising to $4.1 billion in FL 1976. This is roughly equivalent to a 7-percent tax cut for corporate business. Capital spending experienced a boom throughout the 1960's, increasing considerably faster than output. As a result of that boom, and of the recent downturn, business is now operating at 76 percent of capacity. It is, therefore, hard to believe that firms have much of an incentive to increase investment in equipment. The new rules represent a windfall gain for business. Businessmen cannot buy machines for the sake of buying machines; they do so with the expectation that they will be able to produce and sell goods at a profit. This expectation of production at a profit will continue to be absent until something is done to stimulate consumer demand. What is hard is understanding how the President can allocate $2.7 billion to corporate profits while vetoing funds for job training and public service jobs.

—Eagleton (D.-Mo.) *in the Senate March 19* (abr.).

More Humane To Flush Them Out And Shoot Them Than Burn Them Up With Napalm

Sen. Fulbright: Are you familiar with the field study "Observations on the Employment of Riot Control Agent CS in Vietnam," done by the RAND Corporation?

G. Warren Nutter [Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs]: I am familiar that there was such a study, yes, sir.

Sen. Fulbright: Do you know whether this study supports the position that tear gas as used in Vietnam is employed primarily to save civilian or enemy lives and is therefore more humane?

Mr. Nutter: I would not make that assertion, Mr. Chairman, that it would be used primarily for that purpose . . .

Sen. Fulbright: My attention is called to this Carnegie Endowment for International Peace article "The Control of Chemical and Biological Weapons." This is a point we touched on a moment ago, this question of the lethal use of non-lethal weapons. It says "As described in Army training manuals CS is also used in conjunction with artillery and air strikes. If the chemical agent is placed on the target immediately prior to bombardment with anti-personnel munitions the enemy may be panicked into leaving his cover to escape the CS and thereby be rendered more vulnerable to conventional arms." What is your comment on that?

Mr. Nutter: My comment, Mr. Chairman, is that that is a possible use of riot control agents.

Sen. Fulbright: What does that do to your argument about a more humane method of warfare?

Mr. Nutter: I did not intend to make that blunt a statement, Mr. Chairman. My statement was that there are many cases in which the use of riot control agents in pursuit of a legitimate military objective would cause less suffering than the use of other weapons that are not prohibited by the rules of customary international law, and we are not aware of any uses such as this one in which the riot control agent, use of it, would impose more suffering. If the riot control agent were not used some other weapons such as napalm or flame would be substituted for the riot control agent.

—Hearings on the Geneva Protocol and Nixon's effort to exempt herbicides and "riot control" gases before Senate Foreign Relations Committee March 22.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from Page One)

altogether. Several times Humphrey said that Eisenhower and Kennedy took unilateral initiatives to clear the way for arms pacts. But the resolution Humphrey submitted calls neither for unilateral initiatives nor for putting MIRV funds in escrow. Instead it is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution asking Nixon to propose a total ban on, or low-level deployment of, ABM coupled with a mutual freeze on the testing of MIRV and on deploying new missiles during the negotiations.

Like Augustus Caesar

What we object to in the Humphrey speech is its obsequious attitude toward Nixon. "The President, as Commander-in-Chief, is primarily responsible for our security. He, alone," Humphrey said in the manner of a Roman Senator making obeisance to Augustus Caesar, "must make the final decision . . . we owe him our support and allegiance in declaring our own position on the best way to proceed to SALT." After two years of Nixon and 18 months of SALT talks, it is time to cut the cant. Nixon ignored a similar sense-of-the-Senate freeze resolution last April 9, though adopted 72-to-6 by the Senate and supported by the State Department, the CIA and Nixon's own disarmament advisory committee. Behind the "He alone" was the Pentagon and the same military crowd which has just demonstrated its incompetence and mendacity again in Laos.

It is time to say plainly that the SALT talks are a deceptive charade. It is time to state plainly that the Nixon-Laird arms doctrines as revealed in their wordy but opaque posture statements and state of the world messages imply a stepped up race in conventional arms, an intensification of the technological race in research and development, extensive preparation for "limited" nuclear war and a continued increase in nuclear striking power, even if it should be masked by an agreement to impose numerical limits on strategic launchers. The real policy which emerges is a desire to fill what Laird years ago called "the strategy gap", i.e. an ability to use the threat of a nuclear first strike in diplomatic bargaining. That is a dangerous game, and one that cannot be fitted into an arms control agreement.

The reason Humphrey doesn't say these things plainly was indicated in the Moskovitz lecture last January. There he put a call for a MIRV and ABM moratorium in the broader context of foreign policy. That context shows how his own basic attitudes are frozen in a bankrupt past which sought domination through military superiority behind a smokescreen of moral pretensions and led us into the Southeast Asian trap. Let us listen to his words:

> **Any return to isolation violates not only our national interests but our role of morale leadership. We must not let our experience in Vietnam obscure the fact that for 26 years we helped preserve the world from a major war and, in particular, from a nuclear holocaust . . . The primary responsibility for security and development rests with the Asian nations themselves. Chief among these Asian nations is Japan, with whom we have strong ties. These ties must be continued and expanded as the best hope of promoting development and stability in Asia without holding the ring ourselves. *Whatever role we play in Southeast Asia should carefully follow three guidelines: self-help, regional and multilateral assistance and selective involvement.* [*Emphasis added*].**

How does this differ from the Nixon Doctrine? How closely it matches Nixon's own words! What was Vietnam but a "selective involvement"?

Dept. of Post-Mortems

If They Hadn't Been So Vicious, ARVN Might Have Stayed To Tea

"The North Vietnamese reacted in a very vicious, violent fashion."

—Secretary Laird March 22 to reporters after a closed door session with the Senate Appropriations Committee explaining that the Laos drive was nevertheless "going forward according to plan."

"If the enemy had not reacted, they (the South Vietnamese) might have stayed longer."

—Jerry Friedheim, the Pentagon's chief briefer, March 23, explaining that the Laos invasion was really a success and ARVN had "won the overall battle."

"If the pressure were heavy, we couldn't have withdrawn as (safely as) we did."

—Vietnamese Colonel at the official ARVN briefing in Saigon March 22, explaining that the withdrawal was "tactically perfect" (Washington Post, March 23).

The 1970 Index Is Ready Free If You Send A Stamped Addressed Envelope For It

IFS will speak at a peace rally 8 p.m., April 17 at the Unitarian Church, 9601 Cedar Lane, Bethesda

Bi-Weekly Mart

—To subscribe or to send a gift subscription, send $5 with your address and zip code to the address below.

—To get Stone's new collection, **"Polemics and Prophecies: 1967-70"** (Random House: $10) at the special $8.95 price postpaid for Bi-Weekly readers, send check or money order to the address below.

—If you want Stone's new paperback, **"The Killings at Kent State: How Murder Went Unpunished"** (New York Review and Vintage Press) the price is $1.95. It contains the full text, available nowhere else, of the so-called "secret FBI report", the summary of FBI findings prepared by the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department but never submitted to the Ohio Grand Jury.

—Stone's **"Hidden History of the Korean War"**, the inside story of America's first Vietnam, long out of print is available again (Monthly Review Press) $7.50 postpaid.

—Paperback editions (Vintage Press) of Stone's earlier collections, **"In A Time of Torment"** ($1.95) and **"The Haunted Fifties"** ($2.45) at bookstores.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly
4420 29th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20008
$5 A YEAR 4/5/71

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly
4420 29th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20008

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

IMPORTANCE NOTICE: We need time to prepare a definitive study of the SALT talks so we are skipping the next issue, April 19, to prepare a double issue to be dated May 3.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED